

Original Research Article

**A Prospective cross-sectional study to estimate the strength of correlation between colposcopic impression using Reid's Colposcopic Index and Histopathological grading of premalignant lesions of Cervix**

**Dr. Pooja Namdeo<sup>1</sup> (Associate Professor), Dr. Anuradha Gupta<sup>2</sup> (Assistant Professor), Dr. Vinita Agrawal<sup>3</sup> (Professor and Head) Dept. of OBGY, LNCT Medical College & Sewakunj Hospital, Indore, M.P.<sup>1,2&3</sup>**

**Corresponding Authors: Dr. Pooja Namdeo**

**Abstract**

**Background & Methods:** The aim of the study is to estimate the strength of correlation between colposcopic impression using Reid's Colposcopic Index and Histopathological grading of premalignant lesions of Cervix.

**Results:** 65 cases of CIN diagnosed by colposcopy, maximum 52(80%), had 1<sup>st</sup> child birth between 16-20 yrs. All 5 (100%) women who delivered 1<sup>st</sup> child after 25 yrs had cervical inflammation only confirmed by histopathology. It is evident from the above table that most common complaint was discharge per vaginum (74.7%) followed by menstrual irregularities (33.0%).

**Conclusion:** Colposcopy is more than an intermediate link between cytology and histopathology. Colposcopy is a highly sensitive tool in the early diagnosis of dysplasia and invasive cancer. Previously, due to lack of standard diagnostic protocols in conventional colposcopy caused interpretation difficulties, thus the main drawback being interobserver variability. Therefore in the present study we made colposcopic assessment by a scoring system, Reid's Colposcopic Index (RCI) that correlates colposcopic impression with histologic severity. The RCI scoring system is not only useful in taking directed biopsy but also useful for further follow up of low grade lesions, provided site specification is added. Hence, it greatly simplifies learning colposcopy.

**Keywords:** colposcopic, histopathological, premalignant, lesions & cervix.

**Study Design:** Comparative Study.

**Introduction**

"Cancer of the uterine cervix is now regarded as a preventable disease" – this statement by World health Organization cancer committee in 1963 was a milestone in the history of cervical cancer. As per Globocan 2012 Database, cervical cancer is fourth most common cancer in women with an estimated 528,000 new cases and 266,000 deaths, accounting for 7.5% of all female cancer deaths worldwide[1]. Around 85% of burden occur in less developed countries, where it accounts 12% of all female cancers. More and less developed regions of the world

differ not only in cervical cancer incidence but in its mortality too. In less developed regions were more than half of the cases result in deaths, less than one third die in more developed regions<sup>1</sup>. Thus these incidence and mortality rates exemplifies inequity in the implementation of effective and widespread screening programmes aimed at detecting precancerous condition and treating them before they progress to invasive state<sup>[2]</sup>.

In India, in 2002, 134,000 new cases were reported and about 72,600 women died of the disease<sup>2</sup>. Even after a decade, in 2012, no significant decline in the incidence (123,000) as well as mortality (67,000) has been observed in the country. Despite the fact that maximum number of cervical cancer cases are in developing countries, only 5% of women have ever been screened for cervical epithelial abnormalities as compared with 40-50% of women in developed countries<sup>[3]</sup>.

Human papilloma viral (HPV) DNA has been found in almost all cases of invasive cervical cancer (Bosch and de Sanjosé, 2003), making cervical cancer a chronic disease with an infectious aetiology. Around 3-10% of women with HPV develops persistent infections, and are at high risk of developing cervical cancer. The fact that precancerous changes in cervical epithelium can linger for years, make programs focusing on “secondary prevention”, that is, detection and treatment of precancerous lesions, instrumental in preventing cervical cancer cases and deaths<sup>[4-7]</sup>.

## Material and Methods

The present study was conducted on 150 women with abnormal cervixes in the Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Sewakunj Hospital, Gynae OPD, Indore (M.P.), from Jan 2023 to Jan 2024. Data Source: Symptomatic patients with symptoms like vaginal discharge, postmenopausal bleeding, postcoital bleeding, pain abdomen, other gynaecological problems and asymptomatic patients with accidental finding of unhealthy cervix on examination who attended outpatient department of Obst. & Gyne.

On first visit to OPD, after taking history as per proforma, patient was put in dorsal position and P/S examination was done for either including or excluding the case from study. If possible sample for cytology was collected & sent for cytological examination. On next visit patient attended with cytology report and accordingly advised colposcopy. Patient was counseled regarding the procedure, put on lithotomy position and colposcope was brought to focus. Visual inspection of vulva and perineal area was done under bright light. After all preliminary preparations, the widest possible speculum was inserted in vagina to obtain a good view of cervix, which was cleaned with normal saline. Then the patient was subjected to colposcope, initially in low power and then under higher magnifications. When squamo-columnar junction was completely visible, colposcopy was termed satisfactory. Cervix was studied clock wise for various vascular patterns without and then with green filter and other abnormalities. Further 5% freshly prepared glacial acetic acid was applied for 1 minute and acetowhiteness was studied with respect to colour, tone, surface, margin and duration of stay. Lugol's Iodine test was applied and area with mustard yellow or brown colour was looked for. The Reid's Colposcopic scoring was done and depending upon the findings, biopsy was taken from suspicious lesion and sent for HPR examination in labeled bottle with fixative and haemostasis achieved. 9• Speculum was removed and patient was allowed to recover.

**Method of selection:** Patients above 16 years of age with varied parity and socioeconomic status with following exclusion/ inclusion criteria:

**Exclusion Criteria:** 1. Pregnancy

2. Vaginitis

3. Patient on intravaginal medication

4. Patient in menses

5. Obvious cervical growth at the time of examination.

6. Post hysterectomy

7. Post radiation.

**Inclusion Criteria:** 1. Suspicious symptoms like vaginal discharge, postcoital or inter menstrual bleeding and postmenopausal bleeding.

## Result

**Table 1: Age wise distribution and correlation of Colposcopic to histopathological diagnosis**

| Age (yrs)    | Total No.     | Colposcopic Diagnosis (RCI) |               |               |               |              |              | Histopathological Diagnosis |               |               |              |              |
|--------------|---------------|-----------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|-----------------------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|
|              |               | Norm                        | Inf           | CIN1          | CIN2          | CIN3         | Inv Ca       | Inf                         | Mild dysp     | Mod dysp      | Severe dysp  | Inv Ca       |
| 20-30        | 38<br>(25.3%) | 4<br>(10.5%)                | 22<br>(57.9%) | 10<br>(26.3%) | 2<br>(5.3%)   | 0<br>(0.0%)  | 0<br>(0.0%)  | 31<br>(81.6%)               | 5<br>(13.2%)  | 2<br>(5.3%)   | 0<br>(0.0%)  | 0<br>(0.0%)  |
| 31-40        | 57<br>(38.0%) | 3<br>(5.3%)                 | 25<br>(43.8%) | 16<br>(28.1%) | 10<br>(17.5%) | 3<br>(5.3%)  | 0<br>(0.0%)  | 31<br>(54.4%)               | 16<br>(28.1%) | 7<br>(12.3%)  | 3<br>(5.3%)  | 0<br>(0.0%)  |
| 41-50        | 31<br>(20.7%) | 12<br>(38.7%)               | 9<br>(29.1%)  | 4<br>(12.9%)  | 3<br>(9.7%)   | 3<br>(9.7%)  | 0<br>(0.0%)  | 23<br>(74.2%)               | 2<br>(6.5%)   | 3<br>(9.7%)   | 3<br>(9.7%)  | 0<br>(0.0%)  |
| 51-60        | 19<br>(12.7%) | 3<br>(15.7%)                | 4<br>(15.8%)  | 3<br>(15.8%)  | 4<br>(21.1%)  | 3<br>(15.8%) | 2<br>(10.5%) | 6<br>(31.6%)                | 6<br>(31.6%)  | 2<br>(10.5%)  | 3<br>(15.8%) | 2<br>(10.5%) |
| >60          | 5<br>(3.3%)   | 0<br>(0.0%)                 | 0<br>(0.0%)   | 1<br>(20%)    | 2<br>(40%)    | 1<br>(20%)   | 1<br>(20%)   | 0<br>(0.0%)                 | 1<br>(20%)    | 2<br>(40%)    | 1<br>(20%)   | 1<br>(20%)   |
| <b>TOTAL</b> | 150<br>(100%) | 22<br>(14.7%)               | 60<br>(40%)   | 34<br>(22.7%) | 21<br>(14%)   | 10<br>(6.7%) | 3<br>(2%)    | 91<br>(60.7%)               | 30<br>(20%)   | 16<br>(10.7%) | 10<br>(6.7%) | 3<br>(2%)    |

Colposcopic diagnosis- $\chi^2=57.855$ ;  $p<0.0001$

Extremely Significant

Histopathological Diagnosis- $\chi^2=46.189$ ;  $p<0.0001$

Extremely Significant

The mean age of population in present study was 38.1( $\pm$ 10) yrs. Majority, (38%) of cases belonged to the age group 31-40 yrs, out of them 51% cases were of CIN,

45.7% were further confirmed by histopathology. Out of 24 cases studied beyond the age of 51, majority (14) were CIN and 3 were invasive cancer detected colposcopically.

**Table 2: Paritywise distribution and correlation of Colposcopic to histopathological diagnosis**

| Parity          | Total No.     | Colposcopic Diagnosis(RCI) |               |               |               |              |             | Histopathological Diagnosis |               |               |              |             |
|-----------------|---------------|----------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|-------------|-----------------------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|-------------|
|                 |               | Norm                       | Inf           | CIN1          | CIN2          | CIN3         | Inv Ca      | Inf                         | Mild dysp     | Mod dysp      | Severe dysp  | Inv Ca      |
| P <sub>1</sub>  | 16<br>(10.7%) | 4<br>(25.0%)               | 8<br>(50.0%)  | 2<br>(12.5%)  | 2<br>(12.5%)  | 0<br>(0.0%)  | 0<br>(0.0%) | 15<br>(93.7%)               | 1<br>(6.3%)   | 0<br>(0.0%)   | 0<br>(0.0%)  | 0<br>(0.0%) |
| P <sub>2</sub>  | 49<br>(32.7%) | 9<br>(18.4%)               | 27<br>(55.1%) | 8<br>(16.3%)  | 3<br>(6.1%)   | 2<br>(4.1%)  | 0<br>(0.0%) | 41<br>(83.7%)               | 8<br>(16.3%)  | 2<br>(4.1%)   | 0<br>(0.0%)  | 0<br>(0.0%) |
| P <sub>3</sub>  | 33<br>(22.0%) | 6<br>(18.2%)               | 10<br>(30.3%) | 10<br>(30.3%) | 4<br>(12.1%)  | 3<br>(9.1%)  | 0<br>(0.0%) | 18<br>(54.5%)               | 7<br>(21.2%)  | 3<br>(9.1%)   | 3<br>(9.1%)  | 0<br>(0.0%) |
| >P <sub>3</sub> | 52<br>(34.7%) | 3<br>(5.8%)                | 15<br>(28.8%) | 14<br>(26.9%) | 12<br>(23.1%) | 5<br>(9.6%)  | 3<br>(5.8%) | 17<br>(32.7%)               | 14<br>(26.9%) | 11<br>(21.2%) | 7<br>(13.5%) | 3<br>(5.8%) |
| <b>TOTAL</b>    | 150<br>(100%) | 22<br>(14.7%)              | 60<br>(40.0%) | 34<br>(22.7%) | 21<br>(14.0%) | 10<br>(6.7%) | 3<br>(2.0%) | 91<br>(60.7%)               | 30<br>(20.0%) | 16<br>(10.7%) | 10<br>(6.7%) | 3<br>(2.0%) |

Colposcopic diagnosis- $\chi^2=26.679$ ;  $p=0.0315$

Significant

Histopathological Diagnosis- $\chi^2=39.652$ ;  $p<0.0001$

Extremely Significant

It is evident from above table that increase in parity was associated with increase in severity of the disease. Out of 52 cases of parity >3, 32 (60%) were confirmed to have dysplasia, in contrast, only 1 case of parity one had mild dysplasia. Invasive cancers were found in para >3

**Table 3: Distribution according to contraceptive method and correlation of Colposcopic to histopathological diagnosis**

| Contra-<br>-ceptive<br>method | Total No.     | Colposcopic Diagnosis(RCI) |               |               |               |              |             | Histopathological Diagnosis |               |               |                |             |
|-------------------------------|---------------|----------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|-------------|-----------------------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|-------------|
|                               |               | Norm                       | Inf           | CIN1          | CIN2          | CIN3         | Inv Ca      | Inf                         | Mild<br>dysp  | Mod<br>dysp   | Severe<br>dysp | Inv Ca      |
| Non users                     | 68<br>(45.3%) | 8<br>(11.8%)               | 20<br>(29.4%) | 15<br>(22.1%) | 15<br>(22.1%) | 7<br>(10.3%) | 3<br>(4.4%) | 31<br>(47.1%)               | 15<br>(22.1%) | 11<br>(16.2%) | 8<br>(11.8%)   | 3<br>(4.4%) |
| Permanent                     | 39<br>(26.0%) | 5<br>(12.8%)               | 14<br>(35.4%) | 12<br>(30.8%) | 5<br>(12.8%)  | 3<br>(7.7%)  | 0<br>(0.0%) | 20<br>(51.3%)               | 12<br>(30.8%) | 5<br>(12.8%)  | 2<br>(5.1%)    | 0<br>(0.0%) |
| IUCD                          | 12<br>(8.0%)  | 2<br>(16.7%)               | 6<br>(50.0%)  | 4<br>(33.3%)  | 0<br>(0.0%)   | 0<br>(0.0%)  | 0<br>(0.0%) | 10<br>(83.3%)               | 2<br>(16.7%)  | 0<br>(0.0%)   | 0<br>(0.0%)    | 0<br>(0.0%) |
| Barrier                       | 24<br>(16.0%) | 6<br>(25.0%)               | 15<br>(62.5%) | 2<br>(8.3%)   | 1<br>(4.2%)   | 0<br>(0.0%)  | 0<br>(0.0%) | 24<br>(100%)                | 0<br>(0.0%)   | 0<br>(0.0%)   | 0<br>(0.0%)    | 0<br>(0.0%) |
| OCPs                          | 7<br>(4.7%)   | 1<br>(14.3%)               | 5<br>(71.4%)  | 1<br>(14.3%)  | 0<br>(0.0%)   | 0<br>(0.0%)  | 0<br>(0.0%) | 6<br>(85.7%)                | 1<br>(14.3%)  | 0<br>(0.0%)   | 0<br>(0.0%)    | 0<br>(0.0%) |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                  | 150<br>(100%) | 22<br>(14.7%)              | 60<br>(40.0%) | 34<br>(22.7%) | 21<br>(14.0%) | 10<br>(6.7%) | 3<br>(2.0%) | 91<br>(60.7%)               | 30<br>(20.0%) | 16<br>(10.7%) | 10<br>(6.7%)   | 3<br>(2.0%) |

Colposcopic diagnosis- $\chi^2=28.932$ ; p= 0.0891

Not Significant

Histopathological Diagnosis- $\chi^2=34.327$ ; p=0.0049

Significant

In present study 45.3% cases were not using any method of contraception, out of them maximum (54.3%) women had preinvasive lesions & invasive carcinoma (4.4%) diagnosed colposcopically. Maximum high grade dysplastic lesions were found in non-users (27.9%) and those had permanent sterilization (17.9%) and none with the use of barrier, IUCD and OC pill users.

**Table 4: Distribution according to age at 1<sup>st</sup> child birth and correlation of Colposcopic to histopathological diagnosis**

| Age at 1 <sup>st</sup> child birth (in yrs) | Total No.      | Colposcopic Diagnosis(RCI) |               |               |               |              |             | Histopathological Diagnosis |               |               |              |             |
|---|----------------|----------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|-------------|-----------------------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|-------------|
|   |                | Norm                       | Inf           | CIN1          | CIN2          | CIN3         | Inv Ca      | Inf                         | Mild dysp     | Mod dysp      | Severe dysp  | Inv Ca      |
| 16-20                                       | 108<br>(72.0%) | 10<br>(9.3%)               | 43<br>(39.8%) | 26<br>(24.1%) | 17<br>(15.7%) | 9<br>(8.3%)  | 3<br>(2.8%) | 57<br>(52.8%)               | 24<br>(22.2%) | 14<br>(12.9%) | 10<br>(9.3%) | 3<br>(2.8%) |
| 21-25                                       | 37<br>(24.7%)  | 9<br>(24.3%)               | 15<br>(40.5%) | 8<br>(21.6%)  | 4<br>(10.8%)  | 1<br>(2.7%)  | 0<br>(0.0%) | 29<br>(78.4%)               | 6<br>(16.2%)  | 2<br>(5.4%)   | 0<br>(0.0%)  | 0<br>(0.0%) |
| >25   | 5<br>(3.3%)    | 3<br>(60.0%)               | 2<br>(40.0%)  | 0<br>(0.0%)   | 0<br>(0.0%)   | 0<br>(0.0%)  | 0<br>(0.0%) | 5<br>(100%)                 | 0<br>(0.0%)   | 0<br>(0.0%)   | 0<br>(0.0%)  | 0<br>(0.0%) |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                                | 150<br>(100%)  | 22<br>(14.7%)              | 60<br>(40.0%) | 34<br>(22.7%) | 21<br>(14.0%) | 10<br>(6.7%) | 3<br>(2.0%) | 91<br>(60.7%)               | 30<br>(20.0%) | 16<br>(10.7%) | 10<br>(6.7%) | 3<br>(2.0%) |

Colposcopic diagnosis- $\chi^2=16.786$ ; p= 0.0792

Not Significant

Histopathological Diagnosis- $\chi^2=12.911$ ; p=0.1150

Not Significant

It is evident from above table that out of 65 cases of CIN diagnosed by colposcopy, maximum 52(80%), had 1<sup>st</sup> child birth between 16-20 yrs. All 5 (100%) women who delivered 1<sup>st</sup> child after 25 yrs had cervical inflammation only confirmed by histopathology.

**Table 5: Association with various clinical complaints**

| Clinical complaints      | No. of cases | Percentage (%) |
|--------------------------|--------------|----------------|
| Discharge per vaginum    | 112          | 74.7%          |
| Pain Abdomen             | 28           | 18.3%          |
| Itching in private parts | 23           | 15.8%          |
| Menstrual Irregularities | 48           | 33.0%          |
| Post coital bleeding     | 11           | 7.5%           |
| Post-menopausal bleeding | 15           | 10.0%          |
| Asymptomatic             | 18           | 11.7%          |

It is evident from the above table that most common complaint was discharge per vaginum (74.7%) followed by menstrual irregularities (33.0%)

## Discussion

Increase in parity is associated with increase in severity of disease. In present study, out of 65 cases of CIN, 13(20%) were of parity two; 17 (26.2%) of parity three and 31(47.7%) were of parity more than three. Para 3 and more was associated with maximum (61.5%) dysplasia and 3cases of invasive cancer confirmed by histopathology[8].

In a study by Mayavati Mhaske et al (2011), significant association was present between multiparity and development of dysplasia / carcinoma cervix. In women with parity more than 4, 26.3% had dysplasia /cancer cervix in contrast to 13.9% in women with parity  $\leq 4$ . In a study by Kamna Gupta et al (2013)158, frequency of dysplasia and cervical carcinoma[9-11].

In present study out of 150 cases ,108(72%) women gave birth to their 1st child at age less than 20 yrs, of which 52(48.1%%) were CIN by colposcopy.100% of women who delivered their 1st child after 25 yrs were symptomatic and were diagnosed to have cervical inflammation by histopathology[12].

In a study by Mayavati Mhaske et al (2011) it was observed that , maximum (30.95%) women had their 1st childbirth at the age  $\leq 18$  years, whereas only 4.76% of women delivered their 1st child after 20 yrs of age. 88.88% of women with dysplasia had delivered their 1st child at or before 18 years. In the study by Yusuf N et al (2011) [13], 12% delivered at age less than 15 year, 62% between 15-20 year, 20% between 21-25 year and 6% at age more than 25 year .

In a study by Kamna Gupta et al (2013), the frequency of LSIL was maximum in cases with  $>30$  years age at first child birth, while HSIL and cervical cancer was maximum who delivered  $<20$  yrs[14].

In present study, out of 150 women, discharge per vaginam was most common complaint in 74.7% women, followed by menstrual irregularities in 33% and pain in abdomen in 18.3%.

In the study by Neerja Bhatla (2007) [15], the presenting complaint was vaginal discharge in 80% cases, irregular vaginal bleeding in 30.0% cases and post coital bleeding in one woman. Similarly in Patiala study by Ashi R Sareen (2001)183 leucorrhoea was the commonest overall complaint. Another study by Dhiraj B Nikumbh et al [16] (2009) leucorrhoea (69.3%) was the main complaint followed by low backache (33.5%) and irregular P\V bleeding (12.2%).

## Conclusion

Colposcopy is more than an intermediate link between cytology and histopathology. Colposcopy is a highly sensitive tool in the early diagnosis of dysplasia and invasive cancer. Previously, due to lack of standard diagnostic protocols in conventional colposcopy caused interpretation difficulties, thus the main drawback being interobserver variability. Therefore in the present study we made colposcopic assessment by a scoring system, Reid's Colposcopic Index (RCI) that correlates colposcopic impression with histologic severity. The RCI scoring system is not only useful in taking directed biopsy but also useful for further follow up of low

grade lesions, provided site specification is added. Hence, it greatly simplifies learning colposcopy.

## References

1. Mayavati Mhaskel, Jawadekar S.J Study Of Association Of Some Risk Factors & Cervical Dysplasia/Cancer Among Rural Women National Journal Of Community Medicine Vol 2 Issue 2 July-Sept 2011
2. Soloman D, Daney D, Kumaran R et al: The 2001 Bethesda system: Terminology for reporting results of cervical cytology. JAMA 2002; 287:2114-1219.
3. World Health organization. Cervical Cancer Screening in Developing Countries. WHO Comprehensive cervical cancer control, a guide for essential practice, evidence based Geneva 2002.
4. Rajendra A Kerkar, Yogesh V Kulkarni et al. Screening For cervical cancer: an overview. J Obstet Gynecol Vol.56, No.2: March/April 2006 Pg 115-112.
5. Ho GY, Burk RD, Klein S, Kadish AS, Chang C.I, Palan P, Basu Tachezy R, Lewis R, Romney S. Persistent genital human papillomavirus infection as a risk factor for persistent cervical dysplasia. J Natl Cancer Inst 1995;87:1365-71.
6. Nasiell K, Roger V, Nasiell M. Behavior of mild cervical dysplasia during long-term follow-up. Obstet Gynecol 1986;67:665-9.
7. Ostor AG, Natural history of cervical intraepithelial Neoplasia. A critical review. Int J Gynecol Pathol; 12, 727 - 735.
8. Mitchell M F Schottfelden D, Tortolero-Lung G et al, Colposcopy: for diagnosis of squamous intraepithelial lesion: A metaanalysis, Gynecol;1998: 91:626-31.
9. Metinkow et al; Nuovoj, Willian AR et al : Natural history of cervical squamous intraepithelial lesions: A meta analysis Obstet Gynecol. 1998, 92 , 727-735.
10. Saripriya Vedantham, Michelle L. Silver, B. Kalpana, et al Determination of VIA Positivity in Cervical Cancer Screening of Women in a Peri-Urban Area in Andhra Pradesh, India. Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev 2010;19:1373- 1380.
11. ANCUTA BOICEA, Correlations between colposcopy and histologic results from colposcopically directed biopsy in cervical precancerous lesions, Rom J Morphol Embryol 2012, 53(3 Suppl):735-741
12. Mutyaba et al. Evaluation of 'See-See and treat' strategy and role of HIV on cervical cancer prevention in Uganda. Reproductive Health 2008;7:4.
13. Kamna Gupta, Prevalence of cervical dysplasia in western Uttar Pradesh, J Cytol. 2013 Oct-Dec; 30(4): 257-262.



14. Mridul Gehlot, Nupur Hoojja, Masheshkumar Lakhiwal; Correlation between colposcopy, cytology and histology in cervical lesions, J. Obstet Gynecol India sept-oct 2001; vol 51; n05; 180-183.
15. Vaidya A, Comparison of pap test among high risk and non-risk female, kathmandu university, medical journal, 2003, Vol 1, No. 1, P: 8-13
16. Panten J, Adami HO, Bergstrom R, Dillner J, Friberg LG, Gustafsson L. et al. Strategies for Global Control of Cervical Cancer. Int J Cancer 1995;60:1-26.